	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/634,379	DEMING, JAMES L.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dan Washburn	2628
All Participants: Status of Application: final rejection issued		
(1) <u>Dan Washburn</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Patrick Holmes</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 12 January 2007	Time: <u>11 am</u>	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		•
Rejection(s) discussed: 101 rejection of claim 8-10		
Claims discussed: 8-10		
Prior art documents discussed: none		
Part II.	•	
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
<ul> <li>□ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>		
·		
	• .	ï
Tan Wh		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Washburn contacted Attorney Holmes to discuss that claims 8-10 are considered non-statutory under 35 USC 101 because the claims are drawn to non-functional descriptive material. Claims 8-10 describe a table of values, which is considered a compilation of data, and is thus considered non-statutory under 35 USC 101. Examiner Washburn recommended cancelling claims 8-10 in order to put the case in allowable form, but Attorney Holmes wanted to see a more detailed explanation of why claims 8-10 are drawn to non-functional descriptive material, so Examiner Washburn agreed to send a detailed written explanation of the rejection of claim 8-10 in a final office action.